

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 7

FEBRUARY 20, 1956



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Ready to Risk Killing Ike In Order to Stay in Power

If the President feels well enough to run, and is reelected we pray that his burdens will not be too heavy for him. This is a decision he must make. But the medical press conference put on at the White House last week was about as dishonest a piece of huckstering as has ever been staged in our nation's capital. The adjoining box gives one sample of an evasive and slippery reply by Dr. Paul Dudley White to a very serious question. In this he was abetted by Jim Hagerty. Six doctors in all took part, and it should be noted that their formal joint medical statement merely registered the details of his "good recovery" and expressed no opinion about whether it would be wise for Mr. Eisenhower to risk a campaign and another term.

It is a pity there was no way for the reporters to poll all six. Only Dr. Howard Snyder, the President's personal physician, and Dr. Paul Dudley White answered questions; indeed most of the talking was done by the latter. Dr. Snyder thought the President could serve "four or five years or longer"; Dr. White, in a personal statement written out on a library card just before the press conference, gave him "another five to ten years." Did the other doctors agree with Dr. White? If so, why didn't they sign that supplementary statement or include it in their own? We infer that they wanted no rash predictions in their formal statement, and that Drs. Snyder and White ventured eagerly but alone where the other physicians feared to tread.

At one point Dr. White would have left the impression that the President was taking no drugs of any kind had not Dr. Snyder broken in to say that he was taking an anti-coagulant. Dr. Snyder was candid enough to admit that he also thought the President in good health just prior to his heart attack, but this reminder was drowned out in the headlines Dr. White's optimism created. The most extraordinary episode of all was Dr. White's answer to the reporter who objected to the phrase "chances are" in his statement, "We believe that medically the chances are that the President should be able to carry on. . . ."

Not Very Honest Answers

Q. Dr. [Paul Dudley] White, if the President decides to run again, would there be any medical limitation on the type of campaign he could conduct?

DR. WHITE. That is a political question more or less, and I think he himself, if he decides to run, would have to answer that. What do you say, Mr. Hagerty?

MR. [James C.] HAGERTY, White House Press Secretary. That is right.

Q. What is the political aspects of a question as to whether or not there is any medical limitation on his ability to campaign? We are asking now from a medical standpoint if it is possible for him to go through a campaign.

DR. WHITE. Well, I don't know about the rigors of a campaign, myself. I am not a politician, so again somebody else will have to answer that.

—White House news conference, Feb. 14.

This colloquy followed:

Q. "Chances are" is a phrase that sometimes is misunderstood.

A. Well, how do you want me to phrase it?

Q. Leave it out. Say that, "We believe that medically the President should be able to."

A. All right; because we have already said "fully aware of the hazards and uncertainties that lie ahead." That's all right.

This may be good press agency but it is not sober medicine. To advise a man in his sixties after a heart attack to risk a Presidential election campaign and four years more amid the tensions and anxieties of the White House is not common sense. We can only conclude that the Republicans are so desperate that they are ready to risk killing Eisenhower if necessary in order to stay in power. This is the feeling which will spread around the country if they pressure him into running as now seems likely.

An Old Colored Lady and Adlai Stevenson

Our favorite remark of the week, if not the year, was made by an elderly colored lady who lives in Montgomery, Alabama. Aubrey Williams reported it in a speech last week-end to the National Lawyers Guild in Detroit. She was walking because of the bus boycott by Negroes in that city and Aubrey, driving by in his car, offered her a lift which she refused. "I'm not tired," she said. "When I used to ride those buses, my feet rode but my spirit would walk. Now my feet walk, but my spirit rides." Our hat is off to that wonderful old lady and to her example. Her words eloquently illuminate the issue of the South, which is a simple one: whether one half of its people are to be allowed to walk or ride as they please without being humiliated by the other half.

By contrast the remark of the week we found most sour was Stevenson's prissy "True integration requires more than the mere presence of children of two races in the same classroom." With that one, Adlai came down with a thump in our once high estimation. The "mere presence of children of two races in the same classroom" may not be "true integration" but it's certainly the necessary first step. Stevenson's nervous suggestion that the school integration issue be taken out of the campaign seemed to us only another example of the way so many of our "better elements" are backing down to mob pressure. Stevenson put himself in the same class with Carmichael of the University of Alabama and Governor Folsom. While that old lady's spirit rides, our hero Adlai runs.

The Shadow of the Growing Political Crisis in France and Italy

The Meaning of Krushchev's Revisions in Communist Doctrine

The striking thing about the Krushchev speech to the Soviet Communist Party Congress is that he begins to admit that the danger of thermonuclear war and the consequent necessity of peaceful co-existence are incompatible with the older Marxist-Leninist view of violent revolution. For violent revolution—and this means civil war—in almost any important country between the two rival great powers would bring on intervention and make world war very difficult to avoid. One need only imagine what would happen were revolution to break out in India or in Italy, threatening to overturn the world balance of power, to see that if the Russians seriously want peace they must at the same time change the tactics of the world Communist parties for whom Moscow is the new Rome.

So those who want world peace, and see mankind's destruction in a new war, must welcome the signs of a shift in Muscovite doctrine. Krushchev departed from Lenin, though not necessarily from Marx's later thinking, when he denied that force and civil war were the only paths to socialism, when he continued the new policy of friendliness to the once reviled Social Democrats, and when he even suggested (a real heresy) that "the parliamentary form" might be used (Lenin said it had to be smashed) and converted from "an organ of bourgeois democracy into an instrument of genuine popular will." This until yesterday was "rightist opportunism."

In this context perhaps the most interesting observation made by Krushchev came when he spoke of the possibility of using parliamentary forms "for the transition to socialism" and then added, "For the Russian Bolsheviks, who were the first to accomplish the transition to socialism, this way was excluded." This begins to recognize that the conclusions drawn by Lenin from Russian experience, where parliamentary forms under the Czars were delusive, do not necessarily fit other countries where parliamentary forms and democratic government have often been the vehicles of peaceful social change and reform. The reader should also notice in this connection that Krushchev speaks of "the right wing bourgeois parties" as being bankrupt, which implies that left-wing "bourgeois" parties may be allies in "the peaceful transition to socialism."

A New Popular Front?

The Krushchev speech is not to be read merely as a new encyclical in Communist political theology. At this very moment the future of France and Italy may well depend on the attitude taken by their Communist parties; they hold the balance of power in the former, and may soon do so in the latter. Despite socialist fears of communist duplicity, a new Popular Front may be necessary in France to meet the North African crisis and the new Fascist threat visible in Poujade. In Italy the pro-Soviet Left Socialists of Nenni have been seeking alliance with the left wing of the Christian Democrats. Some such coalition may be necessary to unite all those in Italy who want social reform against tomorrow's danger of a new Italian Fascism.

Such coalitions could only be stabilizing influences if the Communists in France and Italy can provide some assurance that their support would be something more than a Trojan horse from which first to capture and then liquidate (as happened in the "popular democracies") their non-Communist liberal and socialist allies. Socialist fears of a Communist alliance are all too well founded in recent East European experience. Add the sudden shifts to which Communist line is subject and the slavishly abject dependence of the Communists on Moscow and you begin to see the real dimensions of the problem. Yet unless there is some way to unite the various kinds of people in Italy who want social reform, whether Catholic, Republican, anti-clerical, Socialist and Communist,

Fascism may easily revive since fundamentally nothing in poverty-stricken Italy has happened since the war except to shore up the rotten foundations.

The French situation is not the same but just as critical. The North African revolution deeply touches French national pride; without North Africa, she sinks into a third rate power, facing a resurgent Germany. The white colonists see the fruits of a generation's labor endangered by a primitive and barbaric tide. To get them to give up what they have, to conciliate the miserable Arab masses, and to reconcile them if possible to a new equal life with and within France is the greatest task which has faced French statesmanship since Napoleon. In the national bitterness of failure, a new Fascism may make its thrust. But can Frenchmen unite to fight it, if they must fear that part of their ranks may break away at any time on orders from a foreign source? This is the question which haunts Mollet and Mendes-France.

The Road to Peace Runs Through Paris

The international perspective is as difficult. A growing instability in France and Italy, coupled with an increase in Communist power in both countries, would make relaxation of tension between East and West impossible. Krushchev admits that if good relations are not established between Moscow and Washington, there is no way to cut down the arms race and a tension that must grow more warlike. Yet such good relations will be impossible to achieve if there are crises in France and Italy. This is what makes Communist policy in both countries so important to peace, and this is what makes Krushchev's revisions of Communist doctrine in the direction of peaceful change and social democracy so important.

The question which the Krushchev speech does not deal with is how he can reconcile this responsible attitude toward West European problems with a Middle Eastern policy which rests on arms shipments into so tense an area. The policy of peace cannot be reconciled morally or politically with the kind of dangerous fishing in troubled waters which Moscow pursues in the Middle East. There Russian policy encourages war, and discourages those who would like to see stability created by removing the area from great Power rivalry.

Finally Krushchev's discussion of the Beria affair and liberty within the Soviet state must put liberals and Socialists on warning against too close a Communist embrace. The Communists still have a lot to learn. Krushchev is still talking the kind of coarse demonological rubbish in which he engaged at Belgrade on meeting Tito. If Beria, the highest G-man of the Soviet State was an imperialist agent—and we leave this kind of poppycock to party stomachs—then the whole secret police system stands condemned and a first essential under communism as under any other society is to give the individual rights he can enforce against the police and the state. The injustices Krushchev so conveniently blames on Beria are the same ones which Beria blamed in the same terms on his predecessors. Yet when Krushchev says that "experience has shown that enemies of the Soviet state attempt to use the slightest weakening of Socialist law for their foul subversive activities" he is talking the same witch hunt language we know so well in America and opposing fundamental reforms to make new Berias impossible. All the reforms Krushchev mentions are mere purges from the top in the secret police apparatus—not the basic reforms in criminal procedure promised after Stalin's death and the exposure of the doctors frameup. The demonology still reflected in Krushchev's speech must be gotten rid of if a decent society is to be created. Here, too, the Communists must learn from the best traditions of the West if there is to be progress toward world peace and stability. In this respect, too, revision of "Marxism-Leninism" is overdue.

An Unnoticed Sidelight on the National Council American-Soviet Friendship Case

Apparently the SACB Did Not Believe Budenz Where He Was Contradicted

An unnoticed aspect of the decision by the Subversive Activities Control Board declaring the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship a Communist front concerns Louis Budenz. Budenz was the chief informer witness in the proceeding, and the Board's principal reliance in identifying Council directors as Communist. But in every instance where persons he accused appeared before the Board and entered a denial, their word was taken against Budenz's.

There were seven such witnesses who appeared to testify on behalf of the Council and of themselves. Six of them convinced the hearing examiner, David J. Coddair. These six were Professor Ernest Watson Burgess of the University of Chicago, Dr. John A. Kingsbury, the late Professor Robert Morss Lovett, Professor Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard, Arthur Upham Pope, and the Rev. William B. Spofford. Although all six were named by Budenz, neither the recommended decision by the examiner nor the final decision by the Board included them among the Council directors whom the SACB found to be Communists.

The seventh witness was the Rev. William Howard Melish. He, too, was named by Budenz as a Communist, and in his case the hearing examiner took Budenz's word for it. But the final decision by the Subversive Activities Control Board "reversed" the hearing examiner on Melish and on Leo Krzycki. Coddair listed both as Communists in his recommended decision. The final decision omitted both. Krzycki, a retired vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, was a director of the National Council from 1947 to 1953.

Testimony Mostly Hearsay

In most cases Budenz's identifications were hearsay or inferential. As David Rein, attorney for the National Council, told the SACB in his summation, "the bulk of his identifications were people whom he had no personal knowledge were members of the Communist Party and whom, indeed, he had never met at all. But this was not true in Melish's case.

Budenz testified that in 1944 he met with Melish to see whether the clergyman was loyal enough to the Communist Party to be approved for the chairmanship of the National Council. Budenz said that Melish told him, "I am a loyal member of the Communist Party, speaking to you as a Communist and I would accept Communist party discipline."

Melish in testifying before the SACB produced a diary which showed that his purpose in meeting Budenz on that occasion in 1944 was to write an article for the *Daily Worker* on the Church and the war effort. Melish denied that he had ever made the statement attributed to him and denied that he was a Communist.

The Board Was Dubious

The hearing examiner found Melish's denial "not credible" and listed him among the National Council directors "shown on the record to have been members of the Communist Party" but the Board took Melish's name out and reduced Coddair's finding on Melish to a "cooperative relationship with Party activities on the part of Melish and at least some predisposition toward communism." Obviously the Board did not take Budenz's story at full value.

In no instance during the National Council case did the SACB take an informer's word as to Communist party membership against the word of a witness appearing in his own defense. Of the 31 past or present directors of the National Council who were listed as having been "shown on the record" to be Communists, none had appeared before the Board.

Two conclusions can be drawn from this. One is that it is demonstrably not true that the SACB will always believe an informer as against an accused person. The other is that the Board's finding of party membership as "shown on the rec-

ord" may be an injustice to many of those so named. In most cases the finding does not rest on the sifting of evidence but merely on the uncontradicted hearsay of an informer whom the Board itself disbelieved in other instances where his testimony was contradicted.

The Late Muriel Draper

Let us take a few examples and begin with the one dead person on the list, Muriel Draper. Miss Draper died before the hearings. Three of the Board's witnesses, Malkin, Lautner and Budenz identified her as Communist. But all three testified from hearsay not personal knowledge.

Then there is the case of Elmer A. Benson, once a Farmer Labor Governor of Minnesota. Benson for some time has been so seriously ill that his physicians forbade even the taking of a deposition. He was named as a Communist by Budenz. Why was Budenz's unsupported accusation accepted by the Board?

Of the others named as Communists by Budenz, there are a considerable number who are recognizably non-Communist; we would name them were it not (1) that this would leave an invidious implication about the others and (2) to give their names in this atmosphere is to spread smears. Apparently the standard applied by the SACB was to accept Budenz's testimony where persons he accused of Communism did not appear to contradict him.

The Case of Dirk Struik

The evidentiary yardstick applied by the Board fell far short of that which a court would apply. Let us take the case of Dirk J. Struik, the famous mathematician who has been awaiting trial for years on a Massachusetts indictment charging him with being a Communist. The Board decision listed him as one of the Communist directors of the Council.

Struik was so identified by the informer Glati. But the defense complained that this was a case of circular reasoning, that Glati merely testified that Struik "must have been" a Communist or he would not have been permitted to become chairman of the Council in Massachusetts. This assumes what the Board was trying to prove: that the Council was dominated by the Communist party, and then infers from this assumption that Struik "must have been" a Communist! (The inference in turn was used to prove its premise.)

Of the remaining directors listed by the SACB as Communists, 12 were named both by Budenz and by other informers, but hearsay does not become more than hearsay by being made multiple. Corliss Lamont, for example, was listed as a Communist by the SACB though he testified under oath before the McCarthy committee in 1953 that he was not and never had been a Communist. Four informers, Budenz, Lautner, Fletcher and Malkin called him a Communist before the Board. The only witness who did not speak from hearsay was Malkin, and he spoke from inference. He claimed that in the early '30s he went to Lamont's apartment and said that a "Comrade" had sent him for money.

The Board cannot be blamed for the failure to appear of those named as Communists, though many persons are understandably fearful of risking a possible perjury prosecution by pitting their word against a well-known informer's. In this respect the Board deserves credit. But the Board can be blamed, however, for damaging reputations and livelihood by giving the semblance of an evidentiary finding of Communist party membership in most of these instances. Were this a court proceeding to determine whether X or Y were Communists, such proof by hearsay or inference would not be sufficient for a verdict of guilty.

(The broader issues in the National Council case will be discussed here next week.)

Melodramatic Folly: Were Burgess and MacLean Worth The "Secrets" They Carried Off?

If A Public Dam at Aswan, Why Not at Hell's Canyon?

To buy Egypt's favor the Administration is ready to do something it would scarcely dream of doing here at home: build a public dam. Sen. Richard Neuberger pointed this out as he introduced an almost unnoticed resolution requiring Congress to match every dollar spent for foreign flood control with a dollar to control floods in this country. The administration, he declared, was willing to help Egypt build a \$1,300,000,000 dam at Aswan on the Nile yet it "has told the inhabitants of the Pacific Northwest that we are too poor in purse to erect a dam costing \$350 million . . . at Hells Canyon along the Snake River." He accused the Republicans of choking off a program of American river improvement. "The budget for fiscal 1957," he said, "carries no substantial increase over fiscal 1956 in funds for river control despite the fact that the past year has been troubled by a series of tragic and disastrous floods. . . ."

Melodramatic Folly: We don't know what "secrets" Burgess and MacLean carried off with them to Moscow but they could hardly be worth the damage they have done their own cause and the cause of better relations. They demonstrated that Communists could not be trusted with official secrets and they engaged in exactly the kind of melodrama which is the greatest obstacle to the recovery of world sanity.

But, Of Course: And now there's a plausible explanation of Washington's current interest in the soil bank. "This Administration," Senator Humphrey said in a recent floor debate, "loves the soil bank. I guess it is loved because the word 'bank' is in it." . . . Typical of the Eisenhower Administration is the appointment of former Congressman Wesley D'Ewart to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of Indian Affairs. D'Ewart is anti-Indian. "We do not know anyone," the Pueblo tribal council protested in urging the Senate not to confirm the appointment, "whose records in Congress has shown him to be more anti-Indian." . . .

Poor Defenceless Germany: The biggest threat to NATO at the moment is West Germany's refusal to pay her share of defense costs or to stop dragging her feet on rearmament. The real issue was disclosed when The London Times (Feb. 8) complained, "The result of the delay in German rearmament is that Germany is enjoying a formidable advantage in export markets because her defence programme is making no appreciable demands on manpower or materials." What happens to the theory that only NATO forces protect Germany from Russian invasion when the West Germans themselves don't take defense seriously and exploit NATO to steal a march on their arms burdened West European business competitors!

New Rosenberg Case Fugitive

An hitherto undisclosed figure in the Rosenberg case came to light when Federal Judge McGarraghy upheld the refusal of the State Department to grant Weldon Bruce Dayton a passport. Dayton, a physicist, has been trying for almost two years to get a passport in order to take an appointment at the Tata Institute in Bombay, India.

In June, 1954, Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley wrote Dayton's attorney, Harry I. Rand, that "in view of certain factors" she was not at liberty to disclose, Dayton's passport application was being rejected. It now appears that one of those "factors" was Dayton's acquaintance with a physicist named Alfred Sarant. The legal papers disclose that Sarant fled to Mexico and disappeared in 1950 while under investigation by the FBI in connection with the Rosenberg case.

Dayton's own affidavit denies that he ever was a Communist or ever engaged with Sarant or anyone else in unlawful activities. The affidavit also reveals that Dayton was before grand juries on three occasions in connection with the Rosenberg affair. He was never indicted, but the investigation cost him his academic employment, and apparently also his right to travel.

Iron Curtain Note: The *Chicago Tribune* has been given permission to open a bureau in Moscow and its correspondent is on his way but the State Department refused to give Alan Max, managing editor of the *Daily Worker* a passport to cover the Communist Party Congress in Moscow. . . . Since the *Worker* was given passports three times during the past year, to cover the two Geneva parleys and the Winter Olympics in Italy, the logic of the new refusal is difficult to unravel unless based on new and startling intelligence. . . . This, indeed, seems to be hinted at by the Department in its letter to Max, which says "This action is predicated upon information that you are currently the managing editor of the *Daily Worker*. . . ." Sooner or later those State Department secret agents find out everything!

Robert Morss Lovett passed away last week at 85 after a life of undimmed courage and undeviating devotion to principle. To have lived as Professor Lovett did through such terribly trying (and wonderful) times without ever pulling down one's flag was an achievement so splendid as to make sorrow seem ungrateful. How can one mourn success?

The Date Under Your Name Tells You Whether Your Renewal Is Due

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:
2/20/56

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office